

1 VICKI H. YOUNG
2 Law Offices of Vicki H. Young
3 706 Cowper Street, Suite 205
Palo Alto, California 94301

4 Telephone (415) 421-4347
Fax (650) 289-0636

5 Counsel for Oscar Guzman-Rojas

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8
9
10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 11-269 EJD
11 Plaintiff,)
12 v.) STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE
13 OSCAR GUZMAN-ROJAS,) OF STATUS DATE; [PROPOSED]
14 Defendant.) ORDER
15 _____)

16 It is hereby stipulated between the defendant Oscar Guzman-Rojas, by and through his
17 attorney of record VICKI H. YOUNG, and the government, through Special Assistant United States
18 Attorney Carolyne Sanin that the status date of March 5, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. be continued to March
19 19, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. The reason for this continuance is that the defense counsel has received some
20 reports from the underlying state conviction and needs to review the reports with the defendant
21 before deciding how to proceed in the matter.

22 Under Title 18 U.S. C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv), the continuance is necessary to allow the attorneys
23 for the government and the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking
24 into the account the exercise of due diligence. Since defense counsel needs additional time to
25 review the reports and discuss case developments with her client, the time period from March 5,
26

STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE;
[PROPOSED] ORDER

1 2012, through March 19, 2012, should be excluded.

2 It is so stipulated.

3 Dated: February 29, 2012 Respectfully submitted,

4

5

/s/ Vicki H. Young
VICKI H. YOUNG, ESQ.
Attorney for Oscar Guzman-Rojas

6

7
8 Dated: February 29, 2012 MELINDA HAAG
9
10
11 UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

/s/ Carolyne Sanin
CAROLYNE SANIN
Special Assistant United States Attorney

STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE;
[PROPOSED] ORDER

1
2 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER
3

4 GOOD CAUSE BEING SHOWN, the status date appearance set for March 5, 2012, is
5 continued to March 19, 2012. This Court finds that the period from March 5, 2012, through and
6 including March 19, 2012, is excludable time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161(h). The
7 basis for such exclusion is that additional time is needed for defense counsel review reports with her
8 client. Therefore the ends of justice served by such a continuance outweigh the best interest of the
9 public and the defendants in a Speedy Trial within the meaning of Title 18 U.S.C §3161(h)(7)(A).

10 As required by 18 U.S.C §3161 (h)(7)(A), this Court finds that the reason that the ends of
11 justice outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial are the denial of
12 the continuance would unreasonably deny both the attorney for the government and the attorney for
13 the defendant reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of
14 due diligence. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

15 DATED: March 1, 2012


EDWARD J. DAVILA
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE